

## United States Border Patrol (USBP) Program Decision Option (PDO)

### Southwest Border Surveillance Technology and Tactical Infrastructure

**Is this a new Initiative?** The Southwest Border Surveillance Technology and Tactical Infrastructure (STTI) is an existing initiative comprised of multiple programs that include the San Diego, El Centro, Yuma, Tucson, El Paso, Big Bend, Del Rio, Laredo, and Rio Grande Valley Border Patrol Sectors.



**Summary:** The USBP characterizes a secure border as one of low risk, where there is a high probability of detection coupled with a high probability of interdiction. The intent of the multiple Surveillance Technology and Tactical Infrastructure programs is to provide a well-balanced approach to achieve a secure border.

**Mission/Goal:** The USBP mission is to secure our Nation's border between Ports of Entry (POEs) against all threats. The goals of the Southwest Border STTI programs is to provide a well-balanced approach to achieve a secure border by increasing situational awareness.

**Operational Outcome:** A secure border, characterized by increased certainty of interdiction, arrest, deterrence, public safety, and officer safety, enabled by maximizing situational awareness in order to project effective and efficient capabilities.

**Program Change Summary:** The Southwest Border STTI will meet current USBP requirements by increasing the amount of solutions, modernizing currently deployed assets, and providing for adequate maintenance levels to sustain maximum effectiveness.

**Program Requirements and Justifications:**

Based on 2015 and 2016 capability gap analysis it has been determined that (b) (7)(E)

:  
(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

The table below indicates which capability gaps exist in each sector along the Southwest Border:

	SAN DIEGO	EL CENTRO	YUMA	TUCSON	EL PASO	BIG BEND	DEL RIO	LAREDO	RIO GRANDE VALLEY
(b) (7)(E)									
(b) (7)(E)									
TUNNELS									
(b) (7)(E)									
RESPONSE AND MOBILITY									
(b) (7)(E)									
PHYSICAL SECURITY AND AGENT SAFETY									
(b) (7)(E)									

**Enablers (Materiel and non-materiel solutions):**

Solutions may take the form of either materiel or non-materiel investments. This PDO identifies both but specifically highlights materiel solutions (within the tables below) and the capability gap(s) they address. Investment costs will be identified where possible.

The following tables map surveillance technology and tactical infrastructure to specific capability gaps:

(b) (7)(E)
(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

		Fence
		Access Roads

RESPONSE AND MOBILITY

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

**Deployments and funding estimates for above listed solutions:****Summary of Southwest Border Surveillance Technology, including costs:**

Southwest Border								
Technology	Current Inventory	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPO RT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)								
TOTAL COST							\$ TBD	\$ TBD

\*--SUAS distribution across sectors is to be determined.

## Deployments and funding estimates by Sector:

San Diego Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Ops Support	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

El Centro Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPORT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

Yuma Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPORT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

Tucson Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPORT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

El Paso Sector

Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPORT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

Big Bend Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPORT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

Del Rio Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Ops Support	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						TBD	TBD

Laredo Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPORT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

Rio Grande Valley Sector							
Technology	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	OPS SUPPORT	PC&I Per Year
(b) (7)(E)							
TOTAL COST						\$ TBD	\$ TBD

**Summary of Southwest Border Tactical Infrastructure, including costs:**

	Existing Vehicle Fence	New Miles	Acquisition Cost	Existing Primary Pedestrian Fence	New Miles	Acquisition Cost	Fence Replacement Miles	Acquisition Cost	Existing Secondary Fence	New Miles	Acquisition Cost	Existing Tertiary Fence
SDC	0.4	0.0	0.0	45.9	15.00	105.00	31.40	219.8	13.6	10.00	30.00	2.0
ELC	14.9	0.0	0.0	44.0	3.90	27.30	13.50	94.5	0.0	12.80	38.40	0.0
YUM	43.8	0.0	0.0	62.9	0.00	0.00	17.90	125.3	9.0	2.45	7.35	8.3
TCA	139.4	0.0	0.0	71.8	60.00	420.00	13.60	95.2	0.8	0.00	0.00	0.0
EPT	101.3	0.0	0.0	64.7	233.58	1518.3	108	756	13.4	0.00	0.00	4.0
BBT	0.2	3.3	6.6	4.6	2.87	20.09	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0
DRT	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	38.00	266.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0
LRT	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	53.00	371.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	53.00	159.00	0.0
RGV	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.9	83.00	581.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.0

	Existing All Weather Roads	New Road Construction	Cost	Road Repair**	Cost
SDC	61.9	0.00	0.00	27.00	9.45
ELC	1.1	11.00	29.70	56.00	19.60
YUM	29.5	0.00	0.00	212.66	74.43
TCA	51.6	0.00	0.00	385.00	134.75
EPT	8.6	0.00	0.00	24.50	8.58
BBT	0.0	45.00	121.50	695	243.35
DRT	0.0	210.00	567.00	1200.00	420.00
LRT	3.2	41.00	110.70	175.00	61.25
RGV	0.0	361.00	974.70	375.00	131.25

Solution Categories (b) (7)(E)	
(b) (7)(E)	With increased STTI, principles that guide how operations are conducted may have to be revised or created
	Current operational structure (e.g. (b) (7)(E) ) may need to be adjusted to incorporate new and improved assets
	Funding and staffing will be required for a significant increase in advanced training to meet usage requirements of materiel solutions
	*See above technology and infrastructure tables*
	Cadre of leadership will have to be provided with clear mission direction and end state to successfully manage increase in capabilities
	Current staff may not exist for some of the listed solutions. An estimated 15% of funds will be needed for staffing to support STTI programs
	Real property will have to be increased to accommodate the increase in staffing and materiel solutions
	Federal, State, Tribal, and Local legislative language may have to be amended or created to accommodate program expansion or creation
	Involvement of stakeholders (e.g. public, private, NGO, etc.) will have to increase

The justification for further investment in systems and programs mentioned throughout this document is rooted in USBP's mission to protect the United States by reducing the likelihood that dangerous people and capabilities enter within its borders. The systems and programs cited outside of the (b) (7)(E) framework are a mix of new and replacement materiels. The U.S. Border Patrol strives to ensure that Border Patrol Agents are provided the latest technology to ensure mission achievement and increase officer safety. It is realistic to expect that the adversary will prevail, agent safety will decline, and the public will become less safe without the materiels requested in this document.

Potential for negative mission impact will remain high should critical capability gaps not be mitigated. The USBP must constantly adjust to confront an agile, well-funded and ever adaptive threat,

Without investment, USBP anticipates the following repercussions:

1. Agents will not have the benefit of understanding who and/or what they are about to encounter.
2. Agents will lack critical information that could enable them to successfully and safely interdict criminal activities.
3. Agents will lack the ability to respond in a timely manner to law enforcement events.
4. Agents will not be able to communicate with other agents and/or other first responders at critical moments.
5. Agents will lack the ability to prosecute criminals due to lack of evidence.
6. Agents will be forced to use outdated and obsolete equipment against a modern foe.
7. Agents will drive on poorly maintained roads increasing response times and risk for injury.
8. TCOs will continue to have the confidence, time, and space to conduct illicit activity at their tactical advantage and convenience.
9. TCO's will continue be able to exploit surveillance gaps where the USBP does not have situational awareness.